

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/505,149

Applicant(s)

MULLER-HARTMANN ET AL.

Examiner

LYDIA EDWARDS

Art Unit

1797

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LYDIA EDWARDS.(3) Joyce Von Natzmer.(2) Walter Griffin.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 24 November 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: A working model of the device as claimed was displayed.

Claim(s) discussed: ____.

Identification of prior art discussed: ____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney discussed amending the claims to further clarify and distinguish the claimed invention from prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.